Peer Reviewer Training

Welcome

January 23, 2010
Phase 1 of the Race is On...

Applications are in... from 40 States and D.C.
Reviewers have been selected...
...and the competition begins.

Thank you for your service.
Goals for the Day

- Ensure that you understand:
  - Conflict of interest, ethics, and confidentiality issues
  - Your roles and responsibilities – and those of the ED staff who will be supporting you
  - The Race to the Top program
  - How to score and write comments

- Give you information and time to screen applications for conflicts of interest so that we can finalize assignments
Review Process – The Big Picture

January

Application Review
• Read applications
• Draft your comments & scores

February

Tier I Panel Reviews
• Review and discuss applications
• Finalize your Tier I comments & scores

March

Tier II Finalist Presentations
• Applicant presentations and Q&A
• Finalize your Tier II comments & scores
Agenda for the Day

8:30 – 8:45 Welcome
8:45 – 9:15 Conflict of Interest and Ethics Training
9:15 – 9:30 Confidentiality Agreement
9:30 – 10:00 Overview of the Race to the Top Competition
10:00 – 10:15 Break
10:15 – 11:15 Race to the Top Application Overview – Part 1
11:15 – 11:30 Reviewing Applications and Identifying Conflicts
11:30 – 12:50 Lunch (Reviewers Screen Applications)
Agenda for the Day

12:50-1:00 Race to the Top Staff Introductions
1:00-1:15 Welcome from the Secretary
1:15 – 2:45 Race to the Top Application Overview – Part 2
2:45 – 3:00 Break
3:00 – 4:15 Race to the Top Application Overview – Part 3
4:15 – 4:45 Comments and Scoring
4:45 – 5:15 Introduction to the Application Review System
5:15 – 5:25 Logistical Updates
5:25 – 5:30 Closing
Introductions

- Josh Bendor
  *Race to the Top Program*

- Beth Caron
  *Office of Elementary and Secondary Education*

- Meredith Farace
  *Office of Elementary and Secondary Education*

- Jane Hess
  *Office of the General Counsel*

- Rachel Peternith
  *Office of the General Counsel*

- Joanne Weiss
  *Director, Race to the Top Program*
  *Senior Advisor to the Secretary*
Peer Reviewer Training
Overview of the Race to the Top Competition
January 23, 2010
Goals for this Session

- Peer reviewer training
- Overview of the competition design
- Important dates and timelines
- Roles and responsibilities
- Application review process
- Information release
Peer reviewer training dates

- **January 23**: Peer reviewers and alternate peer reviewers are required to attend today’s training
  - Note: Alternate peer reviewers do not attend any other training unless they have been called on to review applications.

- **February 16**: Peer reviewers will receive training on the first day of the Tier I on-site review

- **March 15**: Those peers who are part of the Tier 2 on-site review will receive training on the first day of that review
Competition design

- **Two Phase process of application submission and review**
  - **Phase 1**: Applications due January 19, 2010. By April 2010, winners of Phase 1 will be announced and feedback will be provided to unsuccessful applicants.
  - **Phase 2**: Applications due June 1, 2010. By September 2010, winners will be announced for Phase 2.

- **Two Tier review process within each Phase**
  - **Initial Tier (Tier 1)**: Reviewers read, comment on, and score assigned applications using selection criteria and scoring rubric.
  - **Finalist Tier (Tier 2)**: Each finalist will send a team to present to and answer questions from the panel of peer reviewers who reviewed its application in Tier 1.
Key roles and responsibilities

- Peer reviewers
- Alternate peer reviewers
- Competition managers
- Panel monitors
- Competition support team
Goals of the peer review process

- Ensure a level playing field for all State applicants in both phases of the competition
- Select expert reviewers, chosen from a pool of qualified educators, policymakers, scholars, and business leaders who are impartial and unbiased
- Maximize intra- and inter-panel reliability and consistency
- Make all applications and results public in order to maximize transparency and minimize external influences
Application review

- Your box of applications
- Using the web-based Application Review System (ARS) for the submission of comments and scoring during the review
- Reviewers will use the scoring rubric and reviewer instructions when scoring and writing comments
How applications are assigned

- Applications have been randomly assigned to reviewers
- Reviewers will be reviewing either four or five applications
- Reviewers will sit on one unique panel for each application he or she is assigned
Race to the Top Process: Applications are not grouped; each application is assigned to a unique panel of reviewers. Each reviewer sits on multiple panels during the competition.
Off-site review and preliminary scoring

• Review time off-site: approximately two weeks (January 25 – February 8, 2010)

• Availability of Department of Education staff to provide logistical guidance

• Contact information for reviewers: send questions to racetothetopreview@ed.gov or call Jessica Clark at 202-205-5272
Tier 1 on-site review

- Reviewers will travel to Washington DC to discuss the applications in panels from February 16-19, 2010
- Time is allotted to rescore and change comments, if desired
- After the Tier 1 on-site review, we will prepare a slate for the Secretary, based on your reviews, and the Secretary will select the States that move on to Tier 2
Tier 2 on-site review

- Reviewers will attend the Tier 2 on-site review on March 15 – 19, 2010.
- The same reviewers who reviewed a State’s application during Tier 1 will return for the on-site Tier 2 process.
- Reviewers will only observe presentations from the State Teams for the applications that they reviewed and scored in Tier 1.
- The Tier 2 on-site review will be recorded.
Information release - Phase 1

- **Reviewer scores and comments with reviewers’ names redacted**: Posted on the Department’s Website after winners are announced for Phase 1

- **For States that are unsuccessful in Tier 1**: The Department will send the State each reviewers’ final scores and comments (with reviewer names redacted) as soon as possible after Tier 1 so that they can use this information in preparation for a Phase 2 application
Information release – Phase 1 (continued)

• **Recordings of Tier 2 State presentations**: posted with applications after Phase 1

• **Names of peer reviewers** (but not the specific applications that were read by each reviewer): posted on the Department’s Website after winners are announced for Phase 1
Peer Reviewer Training
Workshop on Race to the Top Priorities, Requirements and Criteria

January 23, 2010
Goals for this Session

• Ensure that you understand the Race to the Top competition:
  • Priorities
  • Requirements
  • Selection criteria – together with their related definitions, evidence, and performance measures

• Provide you with the same training and information that applicants received
How the Session is Organized

10:15–11:15 Application Overview and Selection Criteria A
11:15–1:15 Other Sessions and Lunch
1:15–2:45 Selection Criteria B, C and D
2:45–3:00 Break
3:00–4:15 Selection Criteria E, F and Priorities
Overview of the Notice
About Race to the Top

- $4.35B competitive grant to encourage and reward states implementing comprehensive reforms across four key areas:
  - Adopting standards and assessments that prepare students for success in college and the workplace
  - Recruiting, rewarding and retaining effective teachers and principals
  - Building data systems that measure student success and inform teachers and principals how they can improve their practices
  - Turning around the lowest-performing schools

- With an overarching goal of:
  - Driving substantial gains in student achievement
  - Improving high school graduation and college enrollment
  - Narrowing achievement gaps
Overview of the Notice

**States must meet:**

**Application Requirements, e.g.:**
- Signatures of key stakeholders
- Certification from State’s attorney general re: descriptions of State laws
- State Reform Conditions requirements
- Reform Plan requirements

**Program/Other Requirements:**
- Evaluation
- Participating LEA scope of work
- Make work available
- Technical assistance
- State summative assessments

**Eligibility Requirements:**
- Approved for State Fiscal Stabilization prior to award
- No legal barriers at State level to linking student achievement data to teachers and principals for purposes of evaluation

**Applications will be scored based on:**

**Priorities:**
- **Absolute:** Comprehensive approach to education reform
- **Competitive:** Emphasis on STEM
- **Invitational:** Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
- **Invitational:** Expansion and adaptation of statewide longitudinal data systems
- **Invitational:** P-20 coordination, vertical and horizontal alignment
- **Invitational:** School-level conditions for reform, innovation, and learning

**Selection Criteria:**
- State success factors
- Standards and assessments
- Data systems to support instruction
- Great teachers and leaders
- Turning around the lowest-achieving schools
- General

*Note that invitational priorities are not scored.*
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Understanding the Application
How the Pieces Fit Together
Two Types of Selection Criteria

- **State Reform Conditions Criteria** - used to assess State’s progress and success in creating conditions related to the four ARRA education reform areas.

- **Reform Plan Criteria** - used to assess State’s plan for future efforts in the four ARRA education reform areas.
How the Pieces Fit Together
The Parts to Respond to...

For each criterion, there are up to three parts

• **Narrative:** For each criterion the State addresses, the State writes its narrative response in the space provided. States should describe how they have addressed or will address that criterion.

• **Performance Measures:** For several selection criteria, the State is asked to provide goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information.

• **Evidence:** Some selection criteria require specific information requested as supporting evidence. States may also include any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the State’s plan.
State Reform Conditions
Criterion Example
The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(Enter text here.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Recommended maximum response length: Two pages</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Enter text here.)
State Reform Conditions Criterion Example
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system
(24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:
• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 29)
State Reform Conditions Criterion Example

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system
(24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 29)
State Reform Conditions Criterion Example

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system
(24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

*In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.*

Evidence:

• Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(Enter text here.)
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system (24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.

Evidence:

Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

Recommended maximum response length: Two pages

(Enter text here.)

Application Requirement (d)
The State must provide, for each State Reform Conditions Criterion that it chooses to address, a description of the State’s current status in meeting that criterion and, at a minimum, the information requested as supporting evidence for the criterion and the performance measures, if any.

(See application p. 29)
Reviewer Guidance Example (C)(1)  
(In Appendix B)

**General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(1):** In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

**Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):**
- Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.

(C)(1) **(maximum total points: 24)** Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system: The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements.

(See application p. 82)
Reviewer Guidance Example (C)(1)  
(In Appendix B)

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):
- Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.

(C)(1) **(maximum total points: 24)** Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system: The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements.

(See application p. 82)
Reviewer Guidance Example (C)(1)
(In Appendix B)

General Reviewer Guidance for (C)(1): In judging the quality of the applicant’s response to this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks and to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (C)(1):

• Applicants earn two (2) points for every element the State has, out of 12 elements possible.

(C)(1) **(maximum total points: 24)** Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system: The extent to which the State has a statewide longitudinal data system that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements.

(See application p. 82)
Reform Plan Criterion Example
Reform Plan Criterion Example
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 41)
Reform Plan Criterion Example
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criterion elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 41)
Reform Plan Criterion Example

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 41)
Reform Plan Criterion Example
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs *(14 points)*

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

*The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.*

*Recommended maximum response length: One page*

(Enter text here.)

(See application p. 41)
Reform Plan Criterion Example

(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 points)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

The State shall provide its detailed plan for this criterion in the text box below. The plan should include, at a minimum, the goals, activities, timelines, and responsible parties (see Reform Plan Criteria elements in Application Instructions or Section XII, Application Requirements (e), for further detail). Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers must be described and, where relevant, included in the Appendix. For attachments included in the Appendix, note in the narrative the location where the attachments can be found.

Recommended maximum response length: One page

(Enter text here.)

Application Requirement (e)

The State must provide, for each Reform Plan Criterion that it chooses to address, a detailed plan for use of grant funds that includes, but need not be limited to—

(1) The key goals;

(2) The key activities to be undertaken and rationale for the activities, which should include why the specific activities are thought to bring about the change envisioned and how these activities are linked to the key goals;

(3) The timeline for implementing the activities;

(4) The party or parties responsible for implementing the activities;

(5) The information requested in the performance measures, where applicable, and where the State proposes plans for reform efforts not covered by a specified performance measure, the State is encouraged to propose performance measures and annual targets for those efforts; and

(6) The information requested as supporting evidence, if any, for the criterion, together with any additional information the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers in judging the credibility of the State’s plan.

(See application p. 41)
About Performance Measures

- Performance measures include goals and annual targets, baseline data, and other information.
- Reviewers will consider, as part of their evaluations of a State’s application, the extent to which the State has set **ambitious yet achievable** annual targets that support the State’s plan. So reviewers are looking for how States connected the plans in their narratives with their targets, and are asking themselves:
  - Are States being ambitious in what they’re attempting to do?
  - Are they also being realistic in proposing a plan that they can achieve?
  - Have they balanced ambition and achievement thoughtfully and well?
## Performance Measures Example (D)(4)
**Goals:** Baseline data and annual targets

### Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### General goals to be provided at time of application:

Baseline data and annual targets

- Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates’ students.

- Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates’ students.

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

Here, States fill in the actual/baseline data in the first column and annual targets in the next four columns. Reviewers will look for “ambitious yet achievable” targets. States will report status against these targets in annual reports to the Department.

(See application p. 42)
### Performance Measures Example (D)(4)

**General data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General data to be provided at time of application:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teacher credentialing programs in the State.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principal credentialing programs in the State.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in the State.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals in the State.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is a general data collection form to support other calculations. It may provide context to reviewers. Again, States fill in only blank cells...here, that would be only the first column.

(See application p. 42)
### Performance Measures Example (D)(4)

**Heads-up: Data to be requested in annual reports**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teacher credentialing programs in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of teachers prepared by each credentialing program in the State for which the information (as described in the criterion) is publicly reported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no blank cells to fill in here – this table provides a heads-up that these data will be collected as part of annual reporting requirements in the future. Reviewers can ignore these.

(See application p. 43)
Reviewer Guidance Example (D)(4)
(In Appendix B)

**General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(4):** In judging the quality of the applicant’s plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

**Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):**
- The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.

(D)(4) **(maximum total points: 14)** Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—
  
  (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and
  
  (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 85)
Reviewer Guidance Example (D)(4)  
(In Appendix B)

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(4): In judging the quality of the applicant’s plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):
• The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.

(D)(4) **(maximum total points: 14)** Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 85)
Reviewer Guidance Example (D)(4)
(In Appendix B)

General Reviewer Guidance for (D)(4): In judging the quality of the applicant’s plan and annual targets for this criterion, reviewers should refer to what the criterion asks, to the evidence requested in the application and presented by the applicant (if any), and to the elements of a high-quality plan as set forth in application requirement (e).

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(4):
- The criterion must be judged for both teachers and principals.

(D)(4) (maximum total points: 14) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs: The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—
  (i) Link student achievement and student growth (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and
  (ii) Expand preparation and credentialing options and programs that are successful at producing effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 85)
Assigning Points

- The Department has specified total point values at the criterion level (e.g., criterion (C)(1)).
- In some cases, we have also specified point values at the sub-criterion level (e.g., criterion (A)(1)(i)). In the cases where the point totals have not been allocated to sub-criteria, each sub-criterion is weighted equally.
- Your job is to decide how many, of the possible points, an application has earned.

(See application p. 77)
Assigning Points

- Reviewers will use the general ranges below as a guide when awarding points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Point Value</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0 – 12</td>
<td>13 – 33</td>
<td>34 – 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0 – 10</td>
<td>11 – 29</td>
<td>30 – 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 – 9</td>
<td>10 – 25</td>
<td>26 – 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0 – 8</td>
<td>9 – 21</td>
<td>22 – 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 – 8</td>
<td>9 – 20</td>
<td>21 – 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0 – 7</td>
<td>8 – 18</td>
<td>19 – 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>6 – 15</td>
<td>16 – 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 – 5</td>
<td>6 – 14</td>
<td>15 – 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>5 – 10</td>
<td>11 – 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 – 4</td>
<td>5 – 9</td>
<td>10 – 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
<td>3 – 7</td>
<td>8 – 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>6 – 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 – 2</td>
<td>3 – 4</td>
<td>5 – 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>2 – 3</td>
<td>4 – 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>2 – 3</td>
<td>4 – 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This is an excerpt from the corrected version of the scoring rubric)
Selection Criteria and Points

A. State Success Factors (125 points)
B. Standards and Assessments (70 points)
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction (47 points)
D. Great Teachers and Leaders (138 points)
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools (50 points)
F. General Selection Criteria (55 points)
A. State Success Factors
A. State Success Factors

(A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans

(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps

Purposes:

- Front-end organizer
- Statewide reform agenda
- LEA commitment and participation
- State capacity
- Track record
What are Participating LEAs?

- Participating LEAs are LEAs that:
  - Choose to work with the State;
  - Agree to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plan;
  - Have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or other binding agreement with the State; and
  - In return, receive a subgrant (at least 50 percent of a State’s grant award must be passed through to participating LEAs on a formula basis).
Criterion (A)(1)
(A)(1)(i) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it (65 pts)

The extent to which—

(i) The State has set forth a comprehensive and coherent reform agenda that clearly articulates its goals for implementing reforms in the four education areas described in the ARRA and improving student outcomes statewide, establishes a clear and credible path to achieving these goals, and is consistent with the specific reform plans that the State has proposed throughout its application; (5 points)

(See application p. 18)
(ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)

(a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;

(b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers’ union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice);

(See application p. 18)
(A)(1)(ii) Evidence

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii):

- An example of the State’s standard Participating LEA MOU, and description of variations used, if any.
- The completed summary table indicating which specific portions of the State’s plan each LEA is committed to implementing, and relevant summary statistics.
- The completed summary table indicating which LEA leadership signatures have been obtained.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion

(See application p. 19)
## (A)(1) Detailed Table

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

### Detailed Table for (A)(1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Signatures on MOUs</th>
<th>MOU Terms</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participating LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of LEA here</td>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td># of K-12 Students</td>
<td>LEA Supt. (or equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 22)
(ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)

(a) **Terms and conditions** that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;

(b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers’ union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice);

(See application p. 18)
Terms and Conditions

Participating LEAs sign a standard set of terms and conditions that includes, at a minimum:

- Key roles and responsibilities of the State and the LEA
- State recourse for LEA non-performance
- Assurances including, for example, that the LEA:
  - Is familiar with, and committed to, the State’s Race to the Top grant application
  - Will implement all or significant portions of the State’s plan, as indicated in the Preliminary Scope of Work
  - Will provide a Final Scope of Work within 90 days of a grant being awarded, in a manner that is consistent with the Preliminary Scope of Work and with the State’s plan
Model Memorandum of Understanding
(In Appendix D)

Participating LEA Memorandum of Understanding

This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is entered into by and between ______________________________ (“State”) and ________________________________ (“Participating LEA”). The purpose of this agreement is to establish a framework of collaboration, as well as articulate specific roles and responsibilities in support of the State in its implementation of an approved Race to the Top grant project.

SCOPE OF WORK

Exhibit I, the Preliminary Scope of Work, indicates which portions of the State’s proposed reform plans (“State Plan”) the Participating LEA is agreeing to implement. (Note that, in order to participate, the LEA must agree to implement all or significant portions of the State Plan.)

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

A. PARTICIPATING LEA RESPONSIBILITIES

In assisting the State in implementing the tasks and activities described in the State’s Race to the Top application, the Participating LEA subgrantee will:

1) Implement the LEA plan as identified in Exhibits I and II of this agreement;

2) Actively participate in all relevant convenings, communities of practice, or other practice-sharing events that are organized or sponsored by the State or by the U.S. Department of Education (“ED”);

... (continued) ...

(see application p. 65-70)
### (A)(1) Detailed Table

#### Detailed Table for (A)(1)
This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating LEAs</th>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Signatures on MOUs</th>
<th>MOU Terms</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of LEA here</td>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td># of K-12 Students</td>
<td>Y/ N/</td>
<td>(B)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># of K-12 Students in Poverty</td>
<td>LEA Supt. (or equivalent)</td>
<td>Y/ N/</td>
<td>(C)(3)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President of local school board (if applicable)</td>
<td>Y/ N/</td>
<td>(C)(3)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President of Local Teachers Union (if applicable)</td>
<td>Y/ N/</td>
<td>(C)(3)(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses Standard Terms &amp; Conditions</td>
<td>Y/ N/</td>
<td>(D)(2)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(3)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(3)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(5)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(5)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(E)(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For any participating LEA that does not use the “standard” terms and conditions, State must describe the variations.

(See application p. 22)
(A)(1)(ii) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it (65 pts)

(ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)

(a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;

(b) **Scope-of-work descriptions** that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers’ union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice);

(See application p. 18)
### (A)(1) Detailed Table

**Detailed Table for (A)(1)**

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating LEAs</th>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Signatures on MOUs</th>
<th>MOU Terms</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of LEA here</td>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td># of K-12 Students</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Uses Standard Terms &amp; Condition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board (if applicable)</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>President of Local Teachers Union (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ELA Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 22)

State transfers the total participation (numbers and percentages) to the Scope of Work Summary Table.
### Elements of State Reform Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of State Reform Plans</th>
<th>Number of LEAs Participating (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Participating LEAs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Standards and Assessments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Use of local instructional improvement systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Professional development on use of data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Availability and accessibility of data to researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Measure student growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Design and implement evaluation systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Conduct annual evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(a) Use evaluations to inform professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(b) Use evaluations to inform compensation, promotion and retention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(c) Use evaluations to inform tenure and/or full certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv)(d) Use evaluations to inform removal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) High-poverty and/or high-minority schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Quality professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Measure effectiveness of professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 20-21)
(ii) The participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) are strongly committed to the State’s plans and to effective implementation of reform in the four education areas, as evidenced by Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) (as set forth in Appendix D) or other binding agreements between the State and its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) that include— (45 points)

(a) Terms and conditions that reflect strong commitment by the participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to the State’s plans;

(b) Scope-of-work descriptions that require participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to implement all or significant portions of the State’s Race to the Top plans; and

(c) Signatures from as many as possible of the LEA superintendent (or equivalent), the president of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable), and the local teachers’ union leader (if applicable) (one signature of which must be from an authorized LEA representative) demonstrating the extent of leadership support within participating LEAs (as defined in this notice);

(See application p. 18)
Signature Block

- The MOU with participating LEAs includes as many as possible of these signatories – the more signatures the “stronger” the leadership support:
  - LEA superintendent (or equivalent)
  - President of the local school board (or equivalent, if applicable)
  - Local teachers’ union leader (if applicable)
- One signature must, of course, be from an authorized LEA representative
- A counter-signature from the State indicates the State’s acceptance of the LEA’s participation
## (A)(1) Detailed Table

**Detailed Table for (A)(1)**

This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating LEAs</th>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Signatures on MOUs</th>
<th>MOU Terms</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of LEA here</td>
<td># of Schools</td>
<td># of K–12 Students in Poverty</td>
<td>LEA Supt (or equivalent)</td>
<td>President of Local School Board (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(B)(3)</td>
<td>(C)(3)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(C)(3) (iii)</td>
<td>(D)(2) (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2) (iii)</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(3)(i)</td>
<td>(D)(3)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(D)(5)(ii)</td>
<td>(D)(5)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(E)(3)</td>
<td>(E)(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 22)

State transfers the signatures (numbers and percentages) to the Signatures Summary Table.
### (A)(1)(ii)(c) Signature Summary Table

#### Summary Table for (A)(1)(ii)(c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signatures acquired from participating LEAs:</th>
<th>Number of Participating LEAs with all applicable signatures</th>
<th>Number of Signatures Obtained (#)</th>
<th>Number of Signatures Applicable (#)</th>
<th>Percentage (%) (Obtained / Applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA Superintendent (or equivalent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President of Local School Board (or equivalent, if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Teachers’ Union Leader (if applicable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 21)
(A)(1)(iii) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it
(65 pts)

The extent to which --

(iii) The LEAs that are participating in the State’s Race to the Top plans (including considerations of the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty) will translate into broad statewide impact, allowing the State to reach its ambitious yet achievable goals, overall and by student subgroup, for—(15 points)

(a) Increasing student achievement in (at a minimum) reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, as reported by the NAEP and the assessments required under the ESEA;

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates (as defined in this notice); and

(d) Increasing college enrollment (as defined in this notice) and increasing the number of students who complete at least a year’s worth of college credit that is applicable to a degree within two years of enrollment in an institution of higher education.

(See application p. 18-19)
Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the **numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty**.
- Tables and graphs that show the State’s goals, overall and by subgroup, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed **detailed table**, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion

(See application p. 19-20)
**Detailed Table for (A)(1)**
This table provides detailed information on the participation of each participating LEA (as defined in this notice). States should use this table to complete the Summary Tables above. (Note: If the State has a large number of participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), it may move this table to an appendix. States should provide in their narrative a clear reference to the appendix that contains the table.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating LEAs</th>
<th>LEA Demographics</th>
<th>Signatures on MOUs</th>
<th>MOU Terms</th>
<th>Preliminary Scope of Work – Participation in each applicable Plan Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of LEA here</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(B)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes/ No</td>
<td>(C)(9)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(C)(9)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(C)(9)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(3)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(3)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(5)(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(D)(5)(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/ N/ NA</td>
<td>(E)(2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State transfers the demographics (numbers and percentages) to the Participating LEA Summary Table

(See application p. 22)
## (A)(1)(iii) LEA Summary Table

### Summary Table for (A)(1)(iii)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participating LEAs (#)</th>
<th>Statewide (#)</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Statewide (%) (Participating LEAs / Statewide)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in poverty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 21)

Here, you get a sense of the scope of the potential impact.
(A)(1)(iii) Evidence

Evidence for (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed summary table indicating the numbers and percentages of participating LEAs, schools, K-12 students, and students in poverty.
- **Tables and graphs that show the State’s goals, overall and by subgroup**, requested in the criterion, together with the supporting narrative. In addition, describe what the goals would look like were the State not to receive an award under this program.

Evidence for (A)(1)(ii) and (A)(1)(iii):

- The completed detailed table, by LEA, that includes the information requested in the criterion

(See application p. 19-20)
Criterion (A)(2)
(A)(2)(i) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (30 pts)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by— (20 points)

(a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans the State has proposed;

(b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices, evaluating these practices’ effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;

(c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;

(d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State’s budget and accompanying budget narrative, to accomplish the State’s plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State’s Race to the Top goals; and

(e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success;

(See application p. 22)
(ii) Use support from a broad group of **stakeholders** to better implement its plans, as evidenced by the strength of the statements or actions of support from— (10 points)

(a) The State’s **teachers and principals**, which include the State’s teachers’ **unions** or statewide teacher associations; and

(b) **Other critical stakeholders**, such as the State’s legislative leadership; charter school authorizers and State charter school membership associations (if applicable); other State and local leaders (e.g., business, community, civil rights, and education association leaders); Tribal schools; parent, student, and community organizations (e.g., parent-teacher associations, nonprofit organizations, local education foundations, and community-based organizations); and institutions of higher education.

(See application p. 23)
Evidence for (A)(2)(i)(d):

- The State’s **budget**, as completed in Section VIII of the application. The narrative that accompanies and explains the budget and how it connects to the State’s plan, as completed in Section VIII of the application.

Evidence for (A)(2)(ii):

- A summary in the narrative of the **statements or actions of support** and inclusion of key statements or actions of support in the Appendix.

(See application p. 24)
Budget
(A)(2)(i) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans (30 pts)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality overall plan to—

(i) Ensure that it has the capacity required to implement its proposed plans by— (20 points)
   (a) Providing strong leadership and dedicated teams to implement the statewide education reform plans
       the State has proposed;
   (b) Supporting participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) in successfully implementing the education
       reform plans the State has proposed, through such activities as identifying promising practices,
       evaluating these practices’ effectiveness, ceasing ineffective practices, widely disseminating and
       replicating the effective practices statewide, holding participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)
       accountable for progress and performance, and intervening where necessary;
   (c) Providing effective and efficient operations and processes for implementing its Race to the Top grant in
       such areas as grant administration and oversight, budget reporting and monitoring, performance
       measure tracking and reporting, and fund disbursement;
   (d) Using the funds for this grant, as described in the State’s budget and accompanying budget
       narrative, to accomplish the State’s plans and meet its targets, including where feasible, by
       coordinating, reallocating, or repurposing education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources
       so that they align with the State’s Race to the Top goals; and
   (e) Using the fiscal, political, and human capital resources of the State to continue, after the period of
       funding has ended, those reforms funded under the grant for which there is evidence of success;

(See application p. 22)
The Parts of the Budget

1. **Budget Summary**
   a. **Table:** Total proposed budget, by category.
   b. **Narrative:** Overview of how the budget has been organized into projects.

2. **Project-Level Detail:**
   a. **Table:** Budget for each project, by category.
   b. **Narrative:** Backup detail for each category in each project budget.

(See application p. 55)
Evaluating the Budget

- The Department will:
  - Determine if the costs are necessary, reasonable, and allowable

- The reviewers will:
  - Determine the extent to which the budget is an accurate reflection of the work proposed in the State’s plans
  - Determine the extent to which the State has thoughtfully coordinated, reallocated, or repurposed education funds from other Federal, State, and local sources so that they align with the State’s Race to the Top goals

(See application p. 55-57)
How Projects Fit into the Budget

- States organize their budgets into “projects.”
- They may design these “projects” in whatever ways best match their proposal/needs. Examples:
  - A State might choose to have one “management project” focused on criterion (A)(2), Building Strong Statewide Capacity.
  - A State might have another “human capital project” that addresses criteria (D)(2) through (D)(5) in the Great Teachers and Leaders section.
- For each project the State has proposed in its Budget Summary Narrative, the State submits a Project-level Budget Table and accompanying Project-level Budget Narrative.

(See application p. 55)
### Project-Level Budget Table

**Project Name:** [fill in the project name the State has assigned to this work]

**Associated with Criteria:** [fill in the designations of the criteria associated with this project]

(Evidence for selection criterion (A)(2)(i)(d))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1 (a)</th>
<th>Project Year 2 (b)</th>
<th>Project Year 3 (c)</th>
<th>Project Year 4 (d)</th>
<th>Total (e)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Funding for Involved LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

(See application p. 58)
## Budget Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Categories</th>
<th>Project Year 1</th>
<th>Project Year 2</th>
<th>Project Year 3</th>
<th>Project Year 4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fringe Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Contractual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Training Stipends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Total Direct Costs (lines 1-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Indirect Costs*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Funding for Involved LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Supplemental Funding for Participating LEAs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Total Costs (lines 9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Funding Subgranted to Participating LEAs (50% of Total Grant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Total Budget (lines 13-14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All applicants must provide a break-down by the applicable budget categories shown in lines 1-15.

Columns (a) through (d): For each project year for which funding is requested, show the total amount requested for each applicable budget category.

Column (e): Show the total amount requested for all project years.

*If you plan to request reimbursement for indirect costs, complete the Indirect Cost Information form at the end of this Budget section. Note that indirect costs are not allocated to lines 11-12.

In the Summary Table, States show the total for each budget category across all project-level budgets.

Involved LEAs are funded for specific activities done statewide.
States may supplement an LEA’s grant (e.g., pilot activity/low share).
States put their participating LEA formula subgrants here.

…and total up each column to arrive at the full grant request.
Criterion (A)(3)
(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps (30 pts)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its ability to—

(i) **Make progress** over the past several years in each of the four education reform areas, and used its ARRA and other Federal and State funding to pursue such reforms; (5 points)

(ii) **Improve student outcomes** overall and by student subgroup since at least 2003, and explain the connections between the data and the actions that have contributed to — (25 points)

(a) Increasing student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA;

(b) Decreasing achievement gaps between subgroups in reading/language arts and mathematics, both on the NAEP and on the assessments required under the ESEA; and

(c) Increasing high school graduation rates.

(See application p. 24)
Evidence for (A)(3)(ii):

- **NAEP and ESEA results since at least 2003:**
  - Include in the Appendix all the data requested in the criterion as a resource for peer reviewers for each year in which a test was given or data was collected. Note that this data will be used for reference only and can be in raw format.
  - In the narrative, provide the analysis of this data and any tables or graphs that best support the narrative.
A Word about Application Requirement (g)

- For student **subgroups with respect to the NAEP**, include:
  - Race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, disability, and limited English proficiency
  - Exclusion rate for students with disabilities (SWDs)
  - Exclusion rate for English language learners (ELLs)
  - Documentation of the State’s policies and practices for determining whether SWDs or ELLs should participate in the NAEP and whether the student needs accommodations

- For student **subgroups with respect to high school graduation rates, college enrollment and college credit accumulation rates, and the assessments required under the ESEA**, include:
  - Economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency

- For the **assessments required under the ESEA**:
  - Refer to section 1111(b)(3) of the ESEA
  - Note any factors (e.g., changes in cut scores) that would impact the comparability of data from one year to the next
Break
B. Standards and Assessments
B. Standards and Assessments

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments

Reform Plan Criteria

(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments

Purposes:

- Encourage the adoption of common standards and assessments
- Support the transition to college and career ready standards and assessments
Criterion (B)(1)
(B)(1)(i) Developing and adopting common standards (40 pts)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B)—

(i) The State’s participation in a consortium of States that— (20 points)

(a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and

(b) Includes a significant number of States; and

(See application p. 25)
(B)(1)(i) Reviewer Guidance
(In Appendix B)

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(i)(b) —

**Significant Number of States:**

- **“High” points** for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.
- **“Medium” or “low” points** are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.

(See application p. 80)
Evidence for (B)(1)(i):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a standards consortium.
- A copy of the final standards or, if the standards are not yet final, a copy of the draft standards and anticipated date for completing the standards.
- Documentation that the standards are or will be internationally benchmarked and that, when well-implemented, will help to ensure that students are prepared for college and careers.
- The number of States participating in the standards consortium and the list of these States.

(See application p. 26)
(B)(1)(ii) Developing and adopting common standards (40 pts)

(ii) — (20 points)

(a) For Phase 1 applications, the State’s high-quality plan demonstrating its commitment to and progress toward adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State, and to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way; or

(b) For Phase 2 applications, the State’s adoption of a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) by August 2, 2010, or, at a minimum, by a later date in 2010 specified by the State in a high-quality plan toward which the State has made significant progress, and its commitment to implementing the standards thereafter in a well-planned way*.

* Phase 2 applicants addressing selection criterion (B)(1)(ii) may amend their June 1, 2010 application submission through August 2, 2010 by submitting evidence of adopting common standards after June 1, 2010. (See application p. 26)
Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(1)(ii) – Adoption:

• **“High” points** are earned for: Phase 1 applicants’ commitment to and progress toward adoption by August 2, 2010; and Phase 2 applicants’ adoption by August 2, 2010.

• **No “Medium” points** are assigned for this criterion.

• **“Low” points** are earned for a high-quality plan to adopt by a specified date later in 2010.

• **No points** are earned for a plan that is not high-quality or for a plan to adopt later than 2010.

(See application p. 81)
Evidence for (B)(1)(ii):

For Phase 1 applicants:

- A description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards, and the State’s plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.

For Phase 2 applicants:

- Evidence that the State has adopted the standards. Or, if the State has not yet adopted the standards, a description of the legal process in the State for adopting standards and the State’s plan, current progress, and timeframe for adoption.
Criterion (B)(2)
(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (10 pts)

The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to improving the quality of its assessments, evidenced by (as set forth in Appendix B) the State’s participation in a consortium of States that—

(i) Is working toward jointly developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice); and

(ii) Includes a significant number of States.

(See application p. 27)
(B)(2) Reviewer Guidance
(In Appendix B)

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (B)(2)(ii) – Significant Number of States:
• “High” points for a significant number of States are earned if the consortium includes a majority of the States in the country.
• “Medium” or “low” points are earned if the consortium includes one-half of the States in the country or less.

(See application p. 81)
(B)(2) Evidence

Evidence for (B)(2):

- A copy of the Memorandum of Agreement, executed by the State, showing that it is part of a consortium that intends to develop high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) aligned with the consortium’s common set of K-12 standards; or documentation that the State’s consortium has applied, or intends to apply, for a grant through the separate Race to the Top Assessment Program (to be described in a subsequent notice); or other evidence of the State’s plan to develop and adopt common, high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice).

- The number of States participating in the assessment consortium and the list of these States.

(See application p. 27)
Criterion (B)(3)
(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments *(20 pts)*

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for supporting a statewide transition to and implementation of internationally benchmarked K-12 standards that build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation, and high-quality assessments (as defined in this notice) tied to these standards. State or LEA activities might, for example, include: developing a rollout plan for the standards together with all of their supporting components; in cooperation with the State’s institutions of higher education, aligning high school exit criteria and college entrance requirements with the new standards and assessments; developing or acquiring, disseminating, and implementing high-quality instructional materials and assessments (including, for example, formative and interim assessments (both as defined in this notice)); developing or acquiring and delivering high-quality professional development to support the transition to new standards and assessments; and engaging in other strategies that translate the standards and information from assessments into classroom practice for all students, including high-need students (as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 28)
(B)(3) Performance Measures - Optional

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Enter measures here, if any.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sometimes performance measures are optional

Performance measures have been requested only where the Department intends to report nationally on them. In other cases, performance measures are optional, but may be included in support of the State’s plan.

(See application p. 29)
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction
C. Data Systems to Support Instruction

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system

Reform Plan Criteria

(C)(2) Accessing and using State data
(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction

Purposes:

• Build out a full statewide longitudinal data system
• Access and use this data to inform decisions
• Provide dynamic data at the local level to improve instruction
Criterion (C)(1)
(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system

(24 points – 2 points per America COMPETES element)

The extent to which the State has a **statewide longitudinal data system** that includes all of the America COMPETES Act elements (as defined in this notice).

*In the text box below, the State shall describe which elements of the America COMPETES Act (as defined in this notice) are currently included in its statewide longitudinal data system.*

Evidence:

- **Documentation for each of the America COMPETES Act elements** (as defined in this notice) that is included in the State’s statewide longitudinal data system.

(See application p. 29)
Criterion (C)(2)
(C)(2) Accessing and using State data (5 pts)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan to ensure that data from the State’s statewide longitudinal data system are accessible to, and used to inform and engage, as appropriate, key stakeholders (e.g., parents, students, teachers, principals, LEA leaders, community members, unions, researchers, and policymakers); and that the data support decision-makers in the continuous improvement of efforts in such areas as policy, instruction, operations, management, resource allocation, and overall effectiveness.

(See application p. 29)
Criterion (C)(3)
Using data to improve instruction (18 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve their instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

(ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).

(See application p. 31)
D. Great Teachers and Leaders
D. Great Teachers and Leaders

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals

Reform Plan Criteria

(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance
(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals

Purposes:

• Build high-quality evaluation systems; evaluate the effectiveness of teachers and principals based on multiple measures, with growth in student achievement as a significant factor
• Use this evaluation data to inform key personnel decisions, allocation decisions, and professional development
• Assess the quality of teacher and principal preparation programs; expand the effective programs
Criterion (D)(1)
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 pts)

The extent to which the State has—

(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

(See application p. 32)
Definition: Alternative Routes to Certification

Pathways to certification that are authorized under the State’s laws or regulations... and have the following characteristics:

a) Can be provided by various types of qualified providers, including both institutions of higher education and other providers operating independently from institutions of higher education;

b) Are selective in accepting candidates;

c) Provide supervised, school-based experiences and ongoing support such as effective mentoring and coaching;

d) Significantly limit the amount of coursework required or have options to test out of courses; and

e) Upon completion, award the same level of certification that traditional preparation programs award upon completion.
(D)(1)(i) Review Guidance
(In Appendix B)

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (D)(1)(i):

- **“High” points** are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers that operate independently of institutions of higher education (IHEs), and (b) include at least 4 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

- **“Medium” points** are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, and (b) include at least 2 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

- **“Low” points** are earned by States that have alternative routes that (a) do not permit providers who operate independently of IHEs, OR (b) include only 1 of the 5 elements listed in the definition of alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 83)
Evidence for (D)(1)(i), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents, including information on the elements of the State’s alternative routes (as described in the alternative route to certification definition in this notice).
(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals (21 pts)

The extent to which the State has—

(i) Legal, statutory, or regulatory provisions that allow alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) for teachers and principals, particularly routes that allow for providers in addition to institutions of higher education;

(ii) Alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice) that are in use; and

(iii) A process for monitoring, evaluating, and identifying areas of teacher and principal shortage and for preparing teachers and principals to fill these areas of shortage.

(See application p. 32)
(D)(1)(ii) Evidence

Evidence for (D)(1)(ii), regarding alternative routes to certification for both teachers and principals:

- A **list of the alternative certification programs** operating in the State under the State’s alternative routes to certification (as defined in this notice), and for each:
  - The **elements of the program** (as described in the alternative routes to certification definition in this notice).
  - The **number of teachers and principals that successfully completed** each program in the previous academic year.
  - The **total number of teachers and principals certified statewide** in the previous academic year.

(See application p. 33)
Criterion (D)(2)
(D)(2)(i-ii) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance \( (58 \text{ pts}) \)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to **measuring student growth** (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; \( (5 \text{ points}) \)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; \( (15 \text{ points}) \)

(See application p. 33)
Excerpts of Relevant Definitions

- **Student growth** means the change in student achievement (as defined in this notice) for an individual student between two or more points in time.

- **Student achievement** means
  
  (a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student’s score on the State’s assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning;
  
  (b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.
(D)(2)(i-ii) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to ensure that participating LEAs (as defined in this notice)—

(i) Establish clear approaches to measuring student growth (as defined in this notice) and measure it for each individual student; (5 points)

(ii) Design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers and principals that (a) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take into account data on student growth (as defined in this notice) as a significant factor, and (b) are designed and developed with teacher and principal involvement; (15 points)

(See application p. 33)
Excerpts of Relevant Definitions

- **Student growth** means the change in student achievement for an individual student between two or more points in time.

- **Student achievement** means
  
  (a) For tested grades and subjects: (1) a student’s score on the State’s assessments under the ESEA; and, as appropriate, (2) other measures of student learning;
  (b) For non-tested grades and subjects: alternative measures of student learning and performance that are rigorous and comparable across classrooms.

- **Effective teacher [principal]** means a teacher whose students achieve acceptable rates (*e.g.*, at least one grade level in an academic year) of student growth…must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth.

- **Highly effective teacher [principal]** means a teacher whose students achieve high rates (*e.g.*, at least one and one-half grade level in an academic year) of student growth… must include multiple measures, provided that teacher effectiveness is evaluated, in significant part, by student growth.
(D)(2)(iii-iv) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance (58 pts)

(iii) Conduct annual evaluations of teachers and principals that include timely and constructive feedback; as part of such evaluations, provide teachers and principals with data on student growth for their students, classes, and schools; (10 points) and

(iv) Use these evaluations, at a minimum, to inform decisions regarding—(28 points)

(a) Developing teachers and principals, including by providing relevant coaching, induction support, and/or professional development;

(b) Compensating, promoting, and retaining teachers and principals, including by providing opportunities for highly effective teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) to obtain additional compensation and be given additional responsibilities;

(c) Whether to grant tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures; and

(d) Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals after they have had ample opportunities to improve, and ensuring that such decisions are made using rigorous standards and streamlined, transparent, and fair procedures.

(See application p. 34)
(D)(2) Performance Measures
Goals: Baseline data and annual targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>General goals to be provided at time of application:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(i)</td>
<td>Percentage of participating LEAs that measure student growth (as defined in this notice).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
<td>Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
<td>Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems for principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)</td>
<td>Percentage of participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems that are used to inform:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(a)</td>
<td>• Developing teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>• Compensating teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>• Promoting teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>• Retaining effective teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>• Granting tenure and/or full certification (where applicable) to teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
<td>• Removing ineffective tenured and untenured teachers and principals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You are evaluating the extent to which the annual targets are:
• consistent with and supported by the proposed plan
• ambitious yet achievable

(See application p. 35)
(D)(2) Performance Measures
General data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General data to be provided at time of application:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of participating LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of principals in participating LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of teachers in participating LEAs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

These “general data” tables may provide context for reviewers

(See application p. 36)
(D)(2) Performance Measures
Heads-up: Data to be requested in annual reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Data to be requested of grantees in the future:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(ii)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iii)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iii)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as ineffective in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform compensation decisions in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(b)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were evaluated as effective or better and were retained in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems who were eligible for tenure in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(c)</td>
<td>Number of teachers in participating LEAs with qualifying evaluation systems whose evaluations were used to inform tenure decisions in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2)(iv)(d)</td>
<td>Number of teachers and principals in participating LEAs who were removed for being ineffective in the prior academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 36-37)
Criterion (D)(3)
(D)(3)(i) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) **Ensure the equitable distribution** of teachers and principals by developing a plan, informed by reviews of prior actions and data, to ensure that **students in high-poverty and/or high-minority schools** (both as defined in this notice) have equitable **access to highly effective** teachers and principals (both as defined in this notice) and are **not served by ineffective teachers and principals** at higher rates than other students; *(15 points)*

(See application p. 37)
(D)(3)(i) Evidence

Evidence for (D)(3)(i):

- Definitions of high-minority and low-minority schools as defined by the State for the purposes of the State’s Teacher Equity Plan.
## Performance Measures for (D)(3)(i)

**Goals:** Baseline data and annual targets

**Note:** All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.

### General goals to be provided at time of application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline data and annual targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are highly effective (as defined in this notice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are high-poverty, high-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principals leading schools that are low-poverty, low-minority, or both (as defined in this notice) who are ineffective.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]
(D)(3)(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals (25 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(ii) Increase the number and percentage of effective teachers (as defined in this notice) teaching hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas including mathematics, science, and special education; teaching in language instruction educational programs (as defined under Title III of the ESEA); and teaching in other areas as identified by the State or LEA. (10 points)

Plans for (i) and (ii) may include, but are not limited to, the implementation of incentives and strategies in such areas as recruitment, compensation, teaching and learning environments, professional development, and human resources practices and processes.

(See application p. 37)
**Performance Measures for (D)(3)(ii)**

**Goals: Baseline data and annual targets**

*Note: All information below is requested for Participating LEAs.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General goals to be provided at time of application:</td>
<td>Baseline data and annual targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of mathematics teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of science teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of special education teachers who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teachers in language instruction educational programs who were evaluated as effective or better.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]

(See application p. 40)
Criterion (D)(4)
(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs (14 pts)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) **Link student achievement and student growth** (both as defined in this notice) data to the students’ teachers and principals, to link this information to the in-State **programs where those teachers and principals were prepared for credentialing**, and to publicly report the data for each credentialing program in the State; and

(ii) **Expand** preparation and credentialing options and **programs** that are successful at **producing effective teachers and principals** (both as defined in this notice).
(D)(4) Performance Measures
Goals: Baseline data and annual targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
<th>Actual Data: Baseline (Current school year or most recent)</th>
<th>End of SY 2010-2011</th>
<th>End of SY 2011-2012</th>
<th>End of SY 2012-2013</th>
<th>End of SY 2013-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General goals to be provided at time of application:</td>
<td>Baseline data and annual targets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of teacher preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates’ students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of principal preparation programs in the State for which the public can access data on the achievement and growth (as defined in this notice) of the graduates’ students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 42)
Criterion (D)(5)
(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) **Provide effective, data-informed professional development**, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 43)
Providing effective support to teachers and principals (20 pts)

The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan for its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) to—

(i) **Provide effective, data-informed professional development**, coaching, induction, and common planning and collaboration time to teachers and principals that are, where appropriate, ongoing and job-embedded. Such support might focus on, for example, gathering, analyzing, and using data; designing instructional strategies for improvement; differentiating instruction; creating school environments supportive of data-informed decisions; designing instruction to meet the specific needs of high-need students (as defined in this notice); and aligning systems and removing barriers to effective implementation of practices designed to improve student learning outcomes; and

(ii) **Measure, evaluate, and continuously improve the effectiveness** of those supports in order to improve student achievement (as defined in this notice).

(See application p. 43)
Break
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools
E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools

State Reform Conditions Criteria

(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs

Reform Plan Criteria

(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools

Purposes:

- Turn around the persistently lowest-achieving schools
- Fully align with Stabilization Fund and upcoming School Improvement Grants
Criterion (E)(1)
(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs (10 pts)

The extent to which the State has the legal, statutory, or regulatory authority to intervene directly in the State’s persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and in LEAs that are in improvement or corrective action status.

Evidence for (E)(1):
A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

(See application p. 44-45)
Reviewer Guidance Specific to (E)(1):

- 10 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in both schools and LEAs.
- 5 points are earned by States that can intervene directly in either schools or LEAs, but not both.
- 0 points are earned by States that cannot intervene in either schools or LEAs.

(See application p. 86)
Criterion (E)(2)
(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools (40 pts)

The extent to which the State has a high-quality plan and ambitious yet achievable annual targets to—

(i) Identify the persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) and, at its discretion, any non-Title I eligible secondary schools that would be considered persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) if they were eligible to receive Title I funds; and (5 points)

(ii) Support its LEAs in turning around these schools by implementing one of the four school intervention models (as described in Appendix C): turnaround model, restart model, school closure, or transformation model (provided that an LEA with more than nine persistently lowest-achieving schools may not use the transformation model for more than 50 percent of its schools). (35 points)

(See application p. 45)
Excerpt from School Intervention Models
(In Appendix C)

- **Turnaround model.** Replace the principal and rehire no more than 50% of the staff, and grant the principal sufficient operational flexibility (including in staffing, calendars/time, and budgeting) to implement fully a comprehensive approach to substantially improve student outcomes.

- **Restart model.** Convert a school or close and reopen it under a charter school operator, a charter management organization, or an education management organization that has been selected through a rigorous review process.

- **School closure.** Close a school and enroll the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are higher achieving.

- **Transformation model.** Implement each of the following strategies: (1) replace the principal; (2) develop and increase teacher and school leader effectiveness; (3) institute comprehensive instructional reform; (4) increase learning time and create community-oriented schools; (5) provide operational flexibility and sustained support.

Note: If an identified school has implemented, in whole or in part within the last two years, an intervention that meets the requirements of the turnaround, restart, or transformation models, the school may continue or complete the intervention being implemented.
(E)(2) Evidence

Evidence for (E)(2):

- The **State’s historic performance on school turnaround**, as evidenced by the total number of persistently lowest-achieving schools (as defined in this notice) that States or LEAs attempted to turn around in the last five years, the approach used, and the results and lessons learned to date.
(E)(2) Evidence and Performance Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Performance Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach Used</strong></td>
<td><strong># of Schools Since SY2004-05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Enter text here.)</td>
<td>(Enter text here.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of schools for which one of the four school intervention models (described in Appendix C) will be initiated each year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data)</td>
<td>(Optional: Enter text here to clarify or explain any of the data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(See application p. 46-47)
F. General
State Reform Conditions Criteria

(F)(1) Making education funding a priority
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions

Purposes:

- General conditions conducive to education reform
Criterion (F)(1)
(F)(1) Making education funding a priority
(10 pts)

The extent to which—

(i) The percentage of the total **revenues** available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were **used to support** elementary, secondary, and public higher **education** for FY 2009 was greater than or equal to the percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice) that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education for FY 2008; and

(ii) The State’s policies lead to **equitable funding** (a) between high-need LEAs (as defined in this notice) and other LEAs, and (b) within LEAs, between high-poverty schools (as defined in this notice) and other schools.

(See application p. 47)
Evidence for (F)(1)(i):

• Financial data to show whether and to what extent expenditures, as a percentage of the total revenues available to the State (as defined in this notice), increased, decreased, or remained the same.

Evidence for (F)(1)(ii):

• Any supporting evidence the State believes will be helpful to peer reviewers.

(See application p. 48)
(F)(1) Reviewer Guidance
(In Appendix B)

Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(1)(i):

• “High” points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education increased from FY2008 to FY2009.

• “Medium” points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education were substantially unchanged from FY2008 to FY2009.

• “Low” points are earned if the percentage of the total revenues available to the State that were used to support elementary, secondary, and public higher education decreased from FY2008 to FY2009.

(See application p. 87)
Criterion (F)(2)
(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 pts)

- Caps
- Authorizers/Accountability
- Facilities
- Funding
- Other innovative, autonomous schools
(F)(2)(i) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 pts)

The extent to which—

(i) The State has a charter school law that does not prohibit or effectively inhibit increasing the number of high-performing charter schools (as defined in this notice) in the State, measured (as set forth in Appendix B) by the percentage of total schools in the State that are allowed to be charter schools or otherwise restrict student enrollment in charter schools;

(See application p. 48-49)
(F)(2)(i) Evidence

Evidence for (F)(2)(i):

- A description of the **State’s applicable laws**, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- The **number of charter schools allowed** under State law and the **percentage this represents of the total number of schools in the State**.
- The number and types of **charter schools currently operating** in the State.

(See application p. 49-50)
Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(i):

- “High” points are earned if the State either has no cap on the number of charter schools, or it has a “high” cap (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” that would be considered even mildly inhibiting.

- “Medium” points are earned if the State has a “medium” cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, ≥5% and <10% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools); or the charter school law has sufficient flexibility to allow for an increase in the number of charter schools as if it were a medium or higher cap (e.g. by allowing for the creation of multiple campuses under the same charter); and the State does not have restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered moderately or severely inhibiting.

- “Low” points are earned if the State has a “low” cap on the number of charter schools (defined as a cap such that, if it were filled, <5% of the total schools in the State would be charter schools) OR if the State has restrictions, such as those referenced in the “note to reviewers” below, that would be considered severely inhibiting.

- No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.

(See application p. 88)
(F)(2)(i) Reviewer Guidance (continued)
(In Appendix B)

**Note to reviewers:** Charter school laws are so complex that it is hard to write rules to capture each possible obstacle to charter school growth; therefore, this rubric is meant to guide reviewers, not to bind them.

For example, if a State limits the number of charter schools by limiting the share of statewide or district-level funding that can go to charter schools, rather than by explicitly limiting the number of charter schools, reviewers should convert the funding restriction into an approximately equivalent limit on the number of schools and fit that into the guidelines here.

As reviewers assess the inhibitions on charter schools, they should look for restrictions such as: disallowing certain types of charter schools (e.g., startups or conversions); restricting charter schools to operate in certain geographic areas; and limiting the number, percent, or demographics of students that may enroll in charter schools. Some States have “smart caps” designed to restrict growth to high-performing charter schools; this is not a problem unless it effectively restricts any new (i.e., unproven) charter schools from starting.

(See application p. 88)
(F)(2)(ii) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools (40 pts)

The extent to which—

(ii) The State has laws, statutes, regulations, or guidelines regarding how charter school authorizers approve, monitor, hold accountable, reauthorize, and close charter schools; in particular, whether authorizers require that student achievement (as defined in this notice) be one significant factor, among others, in authorization or renewal; encourage charter schools that serve student populations that are similar to local district student populations, especially relative to high-need students (as defined in this notice); and have closed or not renewed ineffective charter schools;

(See application p. 48-49)
(F)(2)(ii) Evidence

Evidence for (F)(2)(ii):

- A description of the State’s approach to charter school accountability and authorization, and a description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- For each of the last five years:
  - The number of charter school applications made in the State.
  - The number of charter school applications approved.
  - The number of charter school applications denied and reasons for the denials (academic, financial, low enrollment, other).
  - The number of charter schools closed (including charter schools that were not reauthorized to operate).

(See application p. 49-50)
(F)(2)(iii) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools *(40 pts)*

The extent to which—

(iii) The State’s charter schools receive (as set forth in Appendix B) **equitable funding** compared to traditional public schools, and a commensurate share of local, State, and Federal revenues;

(See application p. 48-49)
(F)(2)(iii) Evidence

Evidence for (F)(2)(iii):

• A description of the State’s applicable laws, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.

• A description of the State’s approach to charter school funding, the amount of funding passed through to charter schools per student, and how those amounts compare with traditional public school per-student funding allocations.

(See application p. 49-50)
Reviewer Guidance Specific to (F)(2)(iii):

• “High” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is \( \geq 90\% \) of that which is provided to traditional public school students.

• “Medium” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is \( 80\%-89\% \) of that which is provided to traditional public school students.

• “Low” points are earned if the per-pupil funding to charter school students is \( \leq 79\% \) of that which is provided to traditional public school students, or the State does not have a charter school law.

• No points are earned if the State has no charter school law.

(See application p. 88)
(F)(2)(iv-v) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools *(40 pts)*

The extent to which—

(iv) The State provides charter schools with funding for **facilities** (for leasing facilities, purchasing facilities, or making tenant improvements), assistance with facilities acquisition, access to public facilities, the ability to share in bonds and mill levies, or other supports; and the extent to which the State does not impose any facility-related requirements on charter schools that are stricter than those applied to traditional public schools; and

(v) The State enables LEAs to **operate innovative, autonomous public schools** (as defined in this notice) **other than charter schools**.

(See application p. 48-49)
(F)(2)(iv-v) Evidence

Evidence for (F)(2)(iv):

- A description of the **State’s applicable laws**, statutes, regulations, or other relevant legal documents.
- A description of the statewide **facilities supports provided** to charter schools, if any.

Evidence for (F)(2)(v):

- A description of **how the State enables LEAs to operate innovative, autonomous public schools** (as defined in this notice) other than charter schools.

(See application p. 49-50)
Criterion (F)(3)
(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions *(5 pts)*

The extent to which the State, in addition to information provided under other State Reform Conditions Criteria, has created, through law, regulation, or policy, *other conditions favorable to education reform or innovation* that have increased student achievement or graduation rates, narrowed achievement gaps, or resulted in other important outcomes.

Evidence for (F)(3):

- A *description of the State’s other applicable key education laws*, statutes, regulations, or relevant legal documents.
Priorities
Priorities

Absolute Priority

- Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform (Yes/No)

Competitive Priority

- Emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) (15 points all or nothing)

Invitational Priorities (No points)

- Innovations for Improving Early Learning Outcomes
- Expansion and Adaptation of Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems
- P-20 Coordination, Vertical and Horizontal Alignment
- School-Level Conditions for Reform, Innovation, and Learning
Absolute Priority – Comprehensive Approach to Education Reform

To meet this priority, the State’s application must comprehensively and coherently address all of the four education reform areas specified in the ARRA as well as the State Success Factors Criteria in order to demonstrate that the State and its participating LEAs are taking a systemic approach to education reform. The State must demonstrate in its application sufficient LEA participation and commitment to successfully implement and achieve the goals in its plans; and it must describe how the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs, will use Race to the Top and other funds to increase student achievement, decrease the achievement gaps across student subgroups, and increase the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers.

Reviewers make a yes/no assessment after completing their scoring.

(See application p. 89)
Absolute Priority

Reviewer Guidance for the Absolute Priority

- The absolute priority cuts across the entire application and should not be addressed separately.
- It is assessed, after the proposal has been fully reviewed and evaluated, to ensure that the application has met the priority.
- This is a yes/no judgment – the application has either met the priority, or it hasn’t.
- If an application has not met the priority, it will be eliminated from the competition.

(See application p. 89)
About the STEM Priority

- Ensuring American competitiveness in a global economy
- Helping schools produce a generation of Americans who can meet the demand for STEM careers
- Focusing attention on the need to:
  - Develop and implement rigorous courses of study in STEM fields
  - Assist teachers in providing effective and relevant instruction in those fields
  - Prepare more students for advanced study and careers in STEM
STEM Priority

To meet this priority, the State’s application must have a high-quality plan that addresses all three aspects of the STEM priority:

i. Offer a **rigorous course of study** in mathematics, the sciences, technology, and engineering;

ii. Cooperate with industry experts, museums, universities, research centers, or other **STEM-capable community partners to prepare and assist teachers** in integrating STEM content across grades and disciplines, in promoting effective and relevant instruction, and in offering applied learning opportunities for students; and

iii. **Prepare more students for advanced study and careers** in the sciences, technology, engineering, and mathematics, including by addressing the needs of underrepresented groups and of women and girls in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
STEM Priority

Reviewer Guidance for the Competitive Priority

- The competitive preference priority will be evaluated in the context of the State’s entire application.
- Therefore, a State that is responding to this priority should address it throughout the application, as appropriate, and provide a summary of its approach to addressing the priority.
- The reviewers will assess the priority as part of their review of a State’s application and determine whether it has been met.
- This is an all-or-nothing judgment. If a State has met the competitive priority, it receives 15 points; if not, it receives 0 points for the priority.

(See application p. 89)
Goals for this Session

- Panel review processes: off-site (reviewing and scoring applications at home) and on-site (panel discussion in DC)
- Instructions for writing effective and focused comments
- Instructions for assigning scores to applications
- Important timelines
- Reviewer resource materials in your notebooks
Off-Site Review Process

- At home read applications and enter preliminary scores and comments in Application Review System (ARS).
  - Be sure you have the correct applications.
  - Double check for conflicts of interest (real or perceived).
- Review applications in non-public locations only.
- Do not discuss applications, the review process, or other information.

- Alternates, remember that you could be called at any point during the review process!
Preliminary Scores and Comments

- Review and score each application independently.
- Scores and comments entered during the off-site review are considered preliminary and will not be made public.
- Enter preliminary scores and comments into ARS.
- Once you are satisfied with them, submit them to ED.
- Submitted comments and scores cannot be edited unless the application is re-opened by ED staff.
- ED program staff will review scores and comments and ask you to clarify or elaborate so that comments clearly reflect and justify your scores.
Preliminary Scores and Comments (Cont.)

- If clarifications or edits are needed, you will get an email from your panel monitor.
- ED staff will then re-open the application for you to edit.
- You will make edits and re-submit.
- All comments and scores must be entered in ARS and submitted to ED by Feb. 8.
- But don’t wait until the last day to submit all of your application reviews and scores.
# Preliminary Comment Submission Timeline

## January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Initial Reviewer Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Application #1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Scores and Comments Entered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Application #4</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Scores and Comments Entered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Application #5</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Scores and Comments Entered</strong></td>
<td><strong>APPLICATION PACKAGE MAILED TO DC</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ALL SCORES AND COMMENTS DUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Check the ARS for Messages from Panel Monitors

| (C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system | 24 |
| (C)(2) Accessing and using State data | 5 |
| (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction | 18 |

**ED Messages**


Writing Comments
Writing Comments: Your Audiences

- **The U.S. Department of Education**
  Comments must provide clear and objective justifications for your scores and a rationale for the number of points you awarded.

- **Race to the Top State Applicants**
  Comments will provide concrete feedback that can inform Phase 2 applications and help applicants understand what “strong” proposals look like.

- **General Public**
  Comments will be posted on the web and will likely be scrutinized by interested members of the public.
Writing Comments: Content

- Explain in detail why you reached the conclusions you did.
- Point to specific information in the application that helped you reach your conclusion.
- Evaluate what the application says; do not simply restate what the applicant has written.
- If information is missing from the application, clearly indicate this in your comments.
- Comments should reflect your best judgment based on the information that the applicant has presented.
Comments Example

_Not useful:_ The project director will spend 10 percent of her time on the project. Teachers will serve as school-based coordinators and spend 50 percent of their time on the project.

_Discussion:_ The comment is ambiguous and non-evaluative. It is unclear whether this is an asset, or how this information relates to the selection criterion.

_Useful:_ The project director will spend 10 percent of her time on the project. This is appropriate and adequate given the limited extent of her responsibilities in the management plan. Most of the project activities will be led and coordinated at the school building level by master teachers who will spend 50 percent of their time on the project. This time commitment is appropriate given the extensive array of activities they will be responsible for carrying out under the management plan.
Writing Comments: Style

- Use complete sentences with proper grammar and spelling.
- Use simple, declarative sentences whenever possible.
- Use statements, not questions.
- Be professional, tactful, and constructive.
- Don’t use statements that infer personal bias – “I feel,” “I think,” “the applicant should”.
- Don’t include page numbers in your comments.
Additional Recommendations

• Take notes so you can locate information during your panel discussions.
• Use Microsoft Word to draft your comments and then copy and paste your comments into the Application Review System (ARS)
  • Allows you to check spelling and grammar
  • Provides a temporary “back-up” file

Resources in your Reviewer Handbook:
• Instructions on Writing Comments
• Examples of Written Comments from Other Programs
Scoring Applications
Reviewer Resources for Scoring

- Scoring Rubric
  - Scoring Chart
  - Low, Medium, High Chart
  - Reviewer Scoring Guidance
- Reviewer Instructions on Scoring Applications
Scoring Applications

- Assign a numerical score for an applicant’s response to the selection criteria.
  - Base scores entirely on the published criteria and scoring rubric.
  - The number of points varies by criterion.
  - Use the full range of points for each criterion. You can assign all the possible points for a criterion, or assign 0 points, so long as you support the scores with your written comments.
- Consider only the information in the application when assigning points.
  - Do not do independent research.
## Scoring Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. State Success Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(1) Articulating State’s education reform agenda and LEAs’ participation in it</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Securing LEA commitment</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ensuring the capacity to implement</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Using broad stakeholder support</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(3) Demonstrating significant progress in raising achievement and closing gaps</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Making progress in each reform area</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Improving student outcomes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Standards and Assessments</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Adopting standards</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(2) Developing and implementing common, high-quality assessments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(3) Supporting the transition to enhanced standards and high-quality assessments</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(1) Fully implementing a statewide longitudinal data system</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(2) Accessing and using State data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)(3) Using data to improve instruction</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Great Teachers and Leaders</strong></td>
<td>138</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Requirement (b) eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(1) Providing high-quality pathways for aspiring teachers and principals</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(2) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Measuring student growth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Developing evaluation systems</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Conducting annual evaluations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Using evaluations to inform key decisions</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(3) Ensuring equitable distribution of effective teachers and principals</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ensuring equitable distribution in high-poverty or high-minority schools</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Ensuring equitable distribution in hard-to-staff subjects and specialty areas</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(4) Improving the effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D)(5) Providing effective support to teachers and principals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E. Turning Around the Lowest-Achieving Schools</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(1) Intervening in the lowest-achieving schools and LEAs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E)(2) Turning around the lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Identifying the persistently lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Turning around the persistently lowest-achieving schools</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. General</strong></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility Requirement (a) eligibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)(1) Making education funding a priority</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)(2) Ensuring successful conditions for high-performing charter schools and other innovative schools</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(F)(3) Demonstrating other significant reform conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scoring Example 1: Criterion (A)(1)

Race to the Top Application Review for Maryland Application #10058 as reviewed by Mary

Reviewer's Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. State Success Factors</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available Tier 1 Tier 2 Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(1) Articulating State's education reform agenda and LEA's participation in it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Articulating comprehensive, coherent reform agenda</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Securing LEA commitment</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Translating LEA participation into statewide impact</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A)(2) Building strong statewide capacity to implement, scale up, and sustain proposed plans

| (i) Ensuring the capacity to implement | 20 |
| (ii) Using broad stakeholder support | 10 |
| (A)(2) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1) | | |
Scoring Example 2: Subcriterion (B)(1)(i)

(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards (40 points)
The extent to which the State has demonstrated its commitment to adopting a common set of high-quality standards, evidenced by—

(i) The State’s participation in a consortium of States that— (20 points)
   (a) Is working toward jointly developing and adopting a common set of K-12 standards (as defined in this notice) that are supported by evidence that they are internationally benchmarked and build toward college and career readiness by the time of high school graduation; and
   (b) Includes a significant number of States, and
Criterion (B)(1) Developing and Adopting Common Standards
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Reviewer's Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards and Assessments</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B)(1) Developing and adopting common standards</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Participating in consortium developing high-quality standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Adopting standards</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(B)(1) Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Enter 0 - 20
Scoring Example 3: Criterion (C)(3)

(C)(3) (maximum total points: 18) Using data to improve instruction: The extent to which the State, in collaboration with its participating LEAs (as defined in this notice), has a high-quality plan to—

(i) Increase the acquisition, adoption, and use of local instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) that provide teachers, principals, and administrators with the information and resources they need to inform and improve instructional practices, decision-making, and overall effectiveness;

(ii) Support participating LEAs (as defined in this notice) and schools that are using instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice) in providing effective professional development to teachers, principals, and administrators on how to use these systems and the resulting data to support continuous instructional improvement; and

(iii) Make the data from instructional improvement systems (as defined in this notice), together with statewide longitudinal data system data, available and accessible to researchers so that they have detailed information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of instructional materials, strategies, and approaches for educating different types of students (e.g., students with disabilities, English language learners, students whose achievement is well below or above grade level).
## Reviewer Guide for Assigning Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum Point Value</th>
<th>Quality of Applicant’s Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0–7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0–1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0–1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(C)(3) Using Data to Improve Instruction
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**Reviewer's Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Data Systems to Support Instruction</th>
<th>Phase I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Review (C)(3) Using data to improve instruction**

**Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)**

Enter 0 - 18
A "checkmark" indicates the application meets this criteria.
Scoring the STEM Priority
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Reviewer's Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Available Tier 1 Tier 2 Init</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Preference Priority 2: Emphasis on STEM</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Competitive Reviewer Comments: (Tier 1)

Enter 0 or 15
Suggested Strategies for Scoring

- Consider writing comments before you assign a score.
- When scoring a criterion, start from zero points and build up from there.
- Re-read your comments for indications that the applicant has addressed the criterion fully and with high quality.
- Refer frequently to the scoring rubric and reviewer guidance to assign points as you build your final score.
Scoring Instructions (Continued)

- Look for and use information in all sections of the application, including budgets and referenced appendices.
- Strive for consistency within and across applications.
- Be sure your scores match your comments.
- Remember to consider only the contents of the application when assigning scores.
Submitting and Printing Scores and Comments

- Be sure all of your comments and scores for each application have been submitted to ED by Feb. 8.

- Print out all sections for each application you reviewed.

- Sign them and put them in the box, with all applications and any notes you want to save for the panel discussion. Mail box to D.C. on February 9.
# Preliminary Comment Submission Timeline

## January 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Initial Reviewer Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Application #1 Scores and Comments Entered</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### February 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>APPLICATION PACKAGE MAILED TO DC</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td><strong>Panel Monitors Review Comments and Scores in ARS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On-Site Panel Review

February 16-19, 2010
On-Site Panel Review

- More training!
- Attend and participate in all panel discussions.
- Discuss your preliminary scores and comments with your panels, identify discrepancies, ask one another clarifying questions.
- Your scores may change as a result of panel discussions. Ensure that any changes are appropriately updated in your comments.
- You and your panel monitor with review each Technical Review Form (TRF) for completeness and sign the TRF.
- Signed TRFs will be reviewed by the competition managers following the conclusion of each panel discussion.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUNDAY</th>
<th>MONDAY</th>
<th>TUESDAY</th>
<th>WEDNESDAY</th>
<th>THURSDAY</th>
<th>FRIDAY</th>
<th>SATURDAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application #3 Scores and Comments Entered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Application #4 Scores and Comments Entered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application #5 Scores and Comments Entered</td>
<td>Application Package Mailed To ARS</td>
<td>Comment Revisions in ARS - as needed</td>
<td>Comment Revisions in ARS - as needed</td>
<td>Comment Revisions in ARS - as needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESIDENT'S DAY *Reviewers Travel</td>
<td>ON-SITE – Tier 1</td>
<td>ON-SITE – Tier 1</td>
<td>ON-SITE – Tier 1</td>
<td>ON-SITE – Tier 1</td>
<td>ON-SITE – Tier 1 3pm – Reviewers Released</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If you have questions during your off-site review
RaceTotheTopReview@ed.gov
or
Jessica Clark,